

Remarks

Entry of the amendments, reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 18-19, 26, 29, 31-35, 43-44, 51, 54, 56-60 and 68-69 remain pending.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the time afforded applicants' attorney, Blanche Schiller, during a telephonic interview on June 3, 2008 with Examiner Chen and Supervisor Wei Zhen. During that telephone conference, proposed amendments to claim 1 were discussed and applicants agreed to amend claim 1 to include the proposed amendments.

With the above amendments, applicants are clarifying one or more aspects of their invention. These amendments are being presented in a bona fide attempt to further prosecution of this application and not in acquiescence to the rejections. In this amendment, applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 18, 19, 26, 29, 31, 32, 43, 44, 51, 54, 56, 57, 68 and 69 and canceled claims 2, 3, 5, 11-17, 20-25, 27, 28, 30, 36-42, 45-50, 52, 53, 55, 61-67 and 70-72 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-7, 11-32, 36-57, and 61-72 prior to this amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner or is unpatentable for any other reasons. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 18, 19, 26, 29, 31, 32, 43, 44, 51, 54, 56, 57, 68 and 69 were amended and claims 2, 3, 5, 11-17, 20-25, 27, 28, 30, 36-42, 45-50, 52, 53, 55, 61-67 and 70-72 were canceled in this amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the remaining claims. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-7, 11-32, 36-57, and 61-72 as presented prior to this amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

In the Office Action, dated March 31, 2008, claims 14-22, 39-47, 50 and 64-72 are objected to because of certain informalities. With the above amendments, these informalities are addressed, and therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of those objections. Additionally, claims 7, 8, 22, 24, 25, 32, 33, 47, 57, 58 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Again, these informalities have been addressed above, and therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the

§112 rejection. Moreover, claims 23-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse this rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the system claims (e.g., claims 26, 29, 31-35, 43, and 44), as amended, recite a computing unit. A computing unit is a physical component, embodiments of which are depicted in FIG. 1 and described in paragraphs 26 - 31 of applicants specification. Therefore, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Yet further, in the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 8, 10-12, 14-17, 20, 22, 26, 32, 33, 35-37, 39-42, 45, 47-51, 57, 58, 60-62, 64-67, 70 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Muratori (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,276); claims 2, 27 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muratori in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,474) and Kiczales (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,390); claims 3, 4, 9 13, 18, 21, 24, 28, 29, 34, 38, 43, 46, 53, 54, 59, 63, 68, and 71 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muratori in view of Kim; and claims 5, 6, 19, 25, 30, 31, 44, 55, 56, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muratori in view of Alexander (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,564). Applicants respectfully, but most strenuously, traverse these rejections to any extent deemed applicable to the amended claims for the reasons below.

In one aspect of applicants' invention, performance data is organized and displayed in a manner that facilitates data analysis. The performance data includes various data, such as, for instance, profile data associated with thread activity of one or more applications.

As one example, the performance data can be organized and displayed in a plurality of display modes, including a function-centric mode focusing on a function perspective and a thread-centric mode focusing on a thread perspective. Further, in one example, a user can dynamically switch between the plurality of modes.

In one particular example, applicants recite a method of presenting data (e.g., independent claim 1). The method includes, for instance, selecting a display mode for displaying thread data of one or more threads of at least one application, said display mode comprising one of a function-centric display mode and a thread-centric display mode,

wherein said selecting comprises dynamically switching, by a user, between said function-centric display mode and said thread-centric display mode; displaying said thread data based on the selected display mode, wherein if the selected display mode is the function-centric display mode, focus is on what happens within one or more functions of the at least one application, and said displaying comprises displaying a hierarchical structure which includes one or more functions having a parental relationship to the one or more threads, the hierarchical structure including corresponding thread data for each of the one or more threads of the one or more functions, and wherein a function includes accumulated thread data of a plurality of threads children to the function; and if the selected display mode is the thread-centric display mode, focus is on thread activity, and said displaying comprises displaying a hierarchical structure in which the one or more threads have a parental relationship to one or more other components of said at least one application, the hierarchical structure including corresponding thread data for each of the one or more threads, said corresponding thread data of a thread including accumulated data of a plurality of components to which the thread has a parental relationship.

Thus, in this aspect of applicants' claimed invention, selecting a display mode includes dynamically switching between the function-centric display mode and the thread-centric display mode. A function-centric display mode focuses on what happens within one or more functions of an application, and the display includes a hierarchical structure which includes one or more functions having a parental relationship to one or more threads. A function includes accumulated thread data of a plurality of threads children to the function. A thread-centric display mode focuses on thread activity, and the hierarchical structure includes corresponding thread data for one or more threads. Corresponding thread data of a thread includes accumulated data of a plurality of components to which the thread has a parental relationship. One or more of these claimed features is not described, taught or suggested in Muratori.

For example, applicants explicitly recite dynamically switching between a function-centric display mode and a thread-centric display mode. In Muratori, there is only one view. That is, Muratori shows a history of each thread when it is running at each point in time. There is no discussion in Muratori of dynamically switching between a function-centric

display mode and a thread-centric display mode. Thus, Muratori does not anticipate applicants' claimed invention.

Further, the additionally cited art does not overcome the deficiencies of Muratori. For instance, neither Kim nor Kiczales describe dynamically switching between a thread-centric mode and a function-centric mode, as those modes are defined in applicants' claims. Thus, the combination of Muratori, Kim and Kiczales fails to describe, teach or suggest at least this aspect of applicants' claimed invention.

Moreover, there is no discussion in Muratori of aggregated data, as claimed by applicants. Instead, Muratori describes point-in-time data, and not accumulated data of a plurality of threads or components, as claimed by applicants. Since Muratori fails to describe, teach or suggest at least this feature, applicants respectfully submit that Muratori does not anticipate applicants' claimed invention. Further, the other cited art does not overcome the deficiencies of Muratori.

Based at least on the foregoing, applicants respectfully request an indication of allowance of claim 1, as well as the other independent claims. Further, the dependent claims are patentable for the same reasons as the independent claims, as well as for their own additional features.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with applicants' attorney, please contact applicants' attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Blanche E. Schiller
Blanche E. Schiller
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 35,670

Dated: June 9, 2008

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI P.C.
5 Columbia Circle
Albany, New York 12203-5160
Telephone: (518) 452-5600
Facsimile: (518) 452-5579